



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING SPECIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE MARCH 16, 2006 Minutes

The Special Meeting of the Special Studies Committee met on Thursday, March 16, 2006 at 6:00 PM in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

Members present: Leo Dierckman, Madeleine Torres, Susan Westermeier, thereby establishing a quorum.

Department of Community Services Staff in attendance: Mike Hollibaugh, Director; Matt Griffin; Christine Holmes.

The Special Studies Committee considered the following items:

- 1. Docket No: 05120025 Z 126th & Keystone/Gramercy PUD - Design Discussion**
The applicant seeks to rezone 116 acres from R2/Residential and R4/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a mixed use development comprised of townhouse, apartment, retail, and office uses.
The site is located between Carmel Drive, 126th Street, Keystone Ave, and Auman Dr.
Filed by James Shinaver of Nelson & Frankenberger for Buckingham Properties Inc.

David Leazenby and Sara Nasuti attended on behalf of Buckingham Properties. Also in attendance: Jim Shinaver, attorney with Nelson & Frankeberger; Matt Brown, A & F Engineering.

David Leazenby presented drawings of the proposed development, building types, details of the area, and the streetscape. The thrust of this review is the PUD Ordinance and Design Guidelines. The petitioner will return for Architectural Design, Lighting, Landscaping & Signage (ADLS) review for each phase of the development; the design guidelines will guide each of the phases.

The PUD Ordinance allows for a variety of uses—a mixture of residential types and retail on the first floor of building plus structured parking.

David reported that there have been 3 neighborhood meetings, two more are on the horizon. The petitioner will continue to have informal meetings as often as possible plus addressing emails and responding to phone calls. Gramercy does have a website and the public is invited to visit www.gramercylifestyle.com.

Conceptually, what could be developed first is the area that now takes in the golf course. The parks, the plaza, and the access points on Auman Drive are shown with a little more detail. This is still a conceptual development plan, but more realistic blocks. The 116-acre development in this block is scaled down to about 25 acres.

The PUD Ordinance has been up-dated since the last meeting to provide for responses from some of the neighborhood meetings. A few things have been added to the PUD Ordinance such as any building adjacent to and fronting on the western property line would be residential and this relates to Auman Drive residential only. There has also been a change to the building height segment to reference 126th Street as well as Auman Drive; any building located along Auman Drive would not have the rear of the building facing the street. In response to concerns raised regarding trash dumpsters, language has been added to the effect that no permanent structure would be visible along that street.

Along 126th Street, the plan provides for two through lanes as it is today, plus appropriate turn lanes for the different access points. The plan along 126th includes street trees, an asphalt path, street lights with hanging baskets, etc. Auman Drive would have a similar sort of character of street trees and landscaping between the residents on the north side of 126th Street and the west side of Auman Drive into the Gramercy Development. The thought is there would be a transition in height, landscaping and setbacks to complement both sides of the street. Building height would be 40 feet along the street—consistent with 2 to 3 story townhomes; setbacks will probably be varied—10 feet from the right-of-way and probably 20 feet from the asphalt path—this would be varied along the street and each building would be 10 to 30 feet. The areas of differing space would off-set and complement the north side of the street, i.e. older buildings.

David Leazenby presented examples of what the building types would look like--two unit buildings, three unit buildings, two and one-half stories, and examples of landscaping and building height. The idea is to transition those homes that are on the north side of 126th Street. David Leazenby agreed to have all of the examples of the building types and renderings available at the neighborhood meetings for the public to view.

In addition to the other things previously mentioned in the PUD, there will be a 40-foot height limit on the buildings. In transitioning the buildings, other types of buildings would include townhomes, apartments, and condos. The general layout of the buildings can be seen with their orientation to the street as well as landscaping and sidewalks. David Leazenby showed some representative photographs of the interior residential components of the project. At this time, it is not exactly known what will be on each block—the intent is to put a framework plan into place so that when the property is redeveloped, it will look like the representations—what is on each block, how many units, those things are not known as yet.

Jim Shinaver commented that at the DP/ADLS phase, it is anticipated that because a specific section would be under focus, all of the detail regarding the types of buildings, number of units and the type of look that would allow flexibility for the developer would be reviewed. Under this review process, different sections could be designed in such a way that they are able to transition into each other. As the petitioner returns to the Commission for each section under DP/ADLS, further review will occur for all of these areas in particular. At this point, we are trying to put all of the framework in place so that there are design guidelines and standards to compare at a future date.

David Leazenby noted that 126th Street has older ranch homes that are wider—the intent is not to have six-unit townhome buildings 50 feet tall, right on the street. This will be spelled out in the PUD Ordinance. The demographics of the development are young professionals, ages 20 to 35, and empty nesters 55 to 65—any of those demographics that do not have school children so that the impact on the school will be minimal. The petitioner has met with the school district and they have indicated that they do not have concerns with the development—no positive or negative feelings—and they do not think the development will impact the school system at all.

Jim Shinaver commented that typically, townhome projects are not associated with a lot of school children but there is a tax base being generated in addition to the mixed-use parcels.

David Leazenby referred to the golf course and open space that is being utilized for building. It is important to point out that the golf course, while open space, is not public open space in that it can be walked on and enjoyed whenever you want. There is a fee to be paid, you play a game, and that is that. With the proposed development, actual public, useable open space would be accessible, within easy walking distance, and located in areas of the site within a 3-minute walk to every residence; the central park would be a 5-minute walk to the entire development. The parks are strategically located.

There were comments/questions about how this project compares to the City Center. David Leazenby said it is important to point out that the City Center is an entertainment, retail development; it is regional and creates a downtown for Carmel and Hamilton County in some respects. The focus is to have an entertainment, regionally focused retail district in the City Center and residential is a complement to that. Contrast that to Gramercy—a residential neighborhood with associated commercial uses to complement—neighborhood service, convenience, etc., and a complete contrast from City Center. A synergy will be created between the two developments—people living in Gramercy will be able to utilize the benefits of the City Center and vice versa; that is how the two relate to one another—Gramercy is not a duplication or copy of City Center. If a Gramercy building has retail, it is in the nucleus of the development. In later versions of the project, it would move towards the southern portion where there is more access for such uses.

David referred to photos in the information booklet regarding creative uses of the automobile. The intent is to accommodate the automobile, but hide it and not emphasize it so that pedestrians have free rein over the streets rather than the cars. The height in the Ordinance is 130 feet and represents 20 feet less than the City Center. The parking demand and the capacity for parking on

S:\PlanCommission\Minutes\Committees\SpecialStudies\2006\2006Mar16

the site will dictate the ultimate height of the building—best guess in the first phase would be a maximum of four (4) to five (5) stories.

Department, Matt Griffin said that 4 stories equate to about 50 feet. Leo Dierckman asked why the petitioner needed the flexibility up to 130 feet.

David Leazenby responded that since the plan is 8 to 12 years, it is not known exactly what 7, 8, or 9 years down the road might require in design guidelines. If there is a market for a building that is 100 feet that complements the City Center and this development, and Plan Commission would review the ADLS, we don't want to say that 130 feet is not possible.

Leo asked that the petitioner focus on the language—a 130-foot tall building might be a problem without having a lot more definition as to what the building will look like. The petitioner can always return. Leo asked that the petitioner concentrate on reducing the height and going with a building that is more of a match, particularly with the west side of the main street on the Auman Drive side. There needs to be less flexibility, better defined utilization of the north/south portion of the western quadrants, if this is to be divided into four pieces. The height restriction needs to be nailed down—there could be more flexibility on the east side of the middle road. At this time, there needs to be more definition and greater protection in place.

In response to questions from the Committee, Matt Griffin reported that a building could be 35 feet tall in the R-2 District.

David Leazenby referred to renderings of interior courtyards that also give an idea of what the taller buildings would look like in the center core area. The other three quadrants have not been laid out yet.

Madeleine Torres said it would be very helpful to see where the bike lanes will be and how wide and where the sidewalks will be—where is the connectivity?

Jim Shinaver said the petitioner would look into that, however, these are conceptual layouts. Jim Shinaver asked that there be a clear understanding that the drawings showing bike lanes, sidewalks, and connections would be conceptual—based on how the site develops and how things may change four years from now, there may be a slight difference in how the development would appear four years into the future.

Jim Shinaver said that the reasoning for showing the particular area as a first phase of development relates to the relationship with the people in the apartment complex at present. The area shown is mainly golf course.

David Leazenby noted that the Mohawk Hills Golf Course will not be open past this year. The lakes on the golf course are man-made and utilized for irrigation; the lakes will not be a part of this development. The drainage system for Gramercy will be handled underground. Scott Brewer, Urban Forester has visited the site and some comments have been received.

Leo Dierckman commented that he would rather see green space that could be utilized as opposed to lakes/drainage ponds that are not useable open space.

Sue Westermeier asked if any of the parks could perhaps be used for football or some sport; David Leazenby responded that the parks within Gramercy are more neighborhood amenities, more passive uses. Recreational parks for playing football, soccer, etc. would be the Central Park in Carmel.

Madeleine Torres asked what the percentage of the overall conceptual plan is the green space—David Leazanby said he would calculate and get back to the Committee.

Leo Dierckman asked that the petitioner bring to the next meeting a conceptual view from Auman Drive—one of the homes, looking into Gramercy with the proposed heights of the buildings, going into the level of detail—parking, green space, buffer—a clear understanding of what that will look like. Also, before the next meeting, members of the Committee need to thoroughly read the PUD because the Committee will go through the details of the document, page-by-page. The petitioner should also bring another quarter of the project or the entire project in the larger scale—it would help. At some point, it might be helpful to name the streets, assign an alpha name, so that we can get a feel for the concept for different heights and different layers of the project.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin. There is a meeting scheduled for next week regarding the landscaping. The Department has some revisions to the PUD; the Department will review next week and have a very definite list of issues or concerns.

Note: A current draft of the PUD will be mailed to the Department and Committee members prior to the next meeting, March 30, 2006.

Public Input: (limited to Architectural Design)

Henry Winckler, representing Central Carmel Preservation Assoc. and Carmel Village neighborhood, was concerned about getting out of his neighborhood after Gramercy is in place. According to Mr. Winckler, the residents of Mohawk are almost terrorized, they have not received communication from Buckingham, and they are concerned about what will happen to housing. Residents purchased homes based on the current zoning and they don't want to be slaves to pollution and environmental degradation, and loss of green space (golf course.) This is like nudging the neighbors out of the way for this development. We don't want increased traffic, tar, and concrete that holds heat and humidity and leads to asthma and a host of other medical conditions. We also don't want to stand for the displacement of our neighbors who are living in what is now affordable housing. We don't want the hanging baskets—we just want the trees that we have and we want to keep it the way it is.

Pat Truelove, 730 West Auman Drive, was not included in the neighborhood meetings and wanted to know where and when those meetings occurred. Has an Environmental Impact Study been done and if so, where is it and what does it say? What is the heat index, weather retention, S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006/2006Mar16

air quality, storm sewer adequacy, sanitary sewer adequacy, and WHERE is the sanitary sewer going to end up—Hazel Dell? If an Environmental Impact has not been done, we would like to request that one would be done so that we know what the effect of this development will be, not only on our neighborhood but also the City of Carmel and surrounding areas. Will the underground water retention affect the Creek that currently flows under Auman and Newark Village? Who will be responsible for the damages if the underground retention causes water to flow into basements and lawns and damages other parts of homes? Has a new soil test been done by Purdue University or with the one utilized for the 20/20 Comp Plan? Why isn't a current plan available if the zoning does go through? Will we have to wait until everything is done before we can be advised as to where and what is going to be located—are there going to be one or two story condos or three story condos along 126th and Auman Drive or are they going to be closer to Keystone? Also, where is there not an alternate plan available if the zoning does not go through—what will the plan be then? Under the 20/20 Comp Plan, a high density area should not be located next to low density areas...has this changed? Why does the current map show the Auman Addition as a medium density area when there are 2.5 homes per acre—according to the 20/20 Plan, that is low density. The only medium density area that surrounds us is the shopping center and Range Line Road—there is a buffer between there. Also, on the first study that was done, Gramercy said only 20 cars or less would go through the Auman Addition—the last meeting it was said that 50 cars would be going through the Auman Addition. Why would it take 4 streets to let 12.5 cars to go through per street—that is ridiculous! They can go through the other streets—you figure it out! Also, while you are thinking about the rezoning, think about what you would like to look at in your neighborhood. This also affects everybody—it could happen in your neighborhood.

Judy Woods, 1125 Fairbanks Drive: If the proposed number of units is 2,000 eventually, and there are two cars per units, that is 4,000 cars—if they come down twice a day, that is 8,000 vehicular trips we are looking at—what would the impact be on our quality of life—air—in Carmel. How many no-zone days do we want to be responsible for? Build it and they will come!

Rick Elkins, 936 Auman Drive. When the Mayor spoke at the neighborhood meeting, he indicated that there would be single story buildings along the Auman section and along 126th Street. Maybe he just didn't clearly understand, but that is what he led us to believe because it would be more sympathetic to the neighborhood to have single-family dwellings graduating into two, then three- story buildings as it progressed away from the neighborhood. We are just going by what he led us to believe. There were at least two representatives from our group that did hear that—I am kind of confused. We are talking two-stories in the presentation and the Mayor is talking single story—we are not sure what it is.

Angie Molt, 740 Auman Drive. Soil Study mentioned earlier by Pat Truelove said the soil is not suitable for building. After the current rain and ducks floating in the water, there is a definite concern for water in our area. I just know the water will runoff onto our side and underground we will end of marshy. I don't have problems now and I don't want problems. This is a health risk—will that be addressed?

Rick Osborne, 807 Auman Drive, would like to see more structures and more detail to help people understand what the petitioner is proposing. Right now, there is not a lot of confidence in what we will end up with. I think Buckingham does a good job, but we need to know specifics—the landscaping, sidewalks—what it will be like. A big issue in the Auman Addition is the retail component and the traffic through the Auman neighborhood. Would like to request that the information that is provided to Council would be available on the Buckingham website. The more information people have, the more comfortable they will be—right now it is just “Trust Us,” and in all honesty, we don’t have the relationship to warrant that.

Leo Dierckman commented that once the Committee finishes its work and reviews the details, there will be another opportunity for public input.

Jennifer Barker, 819 West Auman Drive asked if there were any alternatives to building streets on Auman Drive. It is not just the traffic—it is everything! There are a lot of children in the neighborhood, there are a lot of walkers—pedestrian traffic in the neighborhood, and hopefully there is an alternative to bringing the traffic into the Auman Addition.

Leo Dierckman responded that at the next meeting, they will be following up on the traffic and focusing on the proposed curb cuts onto Auman Drive.

Dave Morrow, 141 Winona Drive, asked about water management—City Center had too much water when they dug into the ground—Mr. Morrow was of the understanding that there is a designated wetlands in the Mohawk area. What is going to happen to all that water? You are taking out the golf course—right now one building has sandbags under it.

Stephanie Hufford, 215 Shoshone Drive, had questions regarding the underground drainage. There are several houses in the housing addition that still have wells—how will the underground drainage affect the wells?

Jean (last name?) Napanee Drive, was concerned about density and noise pollution—trash pickup—with that many residents and retail, there would be a lot of trash and trash pickup.

Troy Burke, 740 East Auman Drive, said the pictures shown tonight is the first time to see what the two-story product would look like along 126th Street. The proposed structure looks like some of the existing homes in the area and Mr. Burke wondered if that same architectural design could go along Auman Drive as well—it is a nice looking product.

Patrick Morton, 1040 West Auman Drive, wondered how the City would guarantee that promises are kept. There are lots of things that have happened in Carmel already where promises have not been kept about trees—that is an important thing.

Marsha Bradley, 120 Ute Drive. Currently the only traffic we have is for the six houses and the Drivers Education car. There must be full disclosure from this company (Buckingham) and they aren’t doing it. All they are disclosing to us are these pretty pictures and talking about hanging

baskets—I don't care about hanging baskets and ponds, I care about when they go through all the way over to their area and they are taking out houses on Oswego, and Auman Drive. The plans show that that is exactly what they are going to do—not tunnel under, not go over—they are going through and what choice do these people have? None! They can put their house up for sale and they have to take whatever the company gives them and that is not fair. This statement really got me—"The Schools will be minimally affected." No! You are going from 524 units to 2,000 units—don't tell me the schools will not be affected. Unless we get full disclosure on things other than the vine covered parking garages, it is just a shame because another neighborhood could be next—what's going to be next? Let's face the future with facts and not fantasy!

Paul Endres, 320 East 126th Street asked how the additional sewage would be handled—how will the sewers accommodate – they are old – 30 years or more, so how can they tie in and how will it affect the neighborhood?

Leo Dierckman responded that the Commission does not have that level of expertise to handle drainage, sewage, storm water, etc.---that is really the Engineering Department. At this time, the plan is conceptual.

Mike Hollibaugh, Director, commented that the Utility issues are looked at on all different levels. This is not only reviewed at the Plan Commission level but all other City Departments—Engineering is looking at storm water management and the drainage issues that came up tonight are currently being looked at conceptually, not the detailed portion as yet. The City Engineers are also looking at traffic impact issues as well as the Department of Community Services in order to determine if this makes sense in the micro-scale as well as the macro. The Department also works with Cinergy; Vectren and Indiana Gas; Utilities—John Duffy deals with water distribution and the sewer issues. The issues brought up tonight are good and the Plan Commission will be asking a lot of tough questions of Buckingham and the Department is also working to make sure that the adjacent neighborhoods are impacted as little as possible. Mike Hollibaugh asked to hear the promises that were not kept, because the Department enforces the Codes and is also trying to make sure that Development Plans conform to what was approved.

At the Rezone stage, (which is what this is) the plans are more conceptual and not as specific as people would like to get into. Because this is a major endeavor, we are going to be a little more specific than normal, but the macro issues will be dealt with. When we start getting into the actual construction part of it, we will start dealing with the issues specific to drainage and how this section will drain while keeping in mind that the petitioner must make sure that micro-drainage issues will be worked out in the big picture and that drainage along Auman Drive will not be damaged or worsened or that a problem is created that was not there before. If you review the track record of the City, you will find that situations in the perimeter have been improved every time there is development and drainage issues are addressed—if not at the Plan Commission level then we go back to make sure that problems that were created will be resolved during the construction process.

Regarding the credibility of Buckingham, the City has worked with Buckingham on other projects and experience dictates that they are good developers and they keep their promises. If there are issues, we will have open dialogue and get the problems resolved. We are starting at a pretty high quality place and as we work through the issues, generally you will find that this will work out to your satisfaction.

John Molitor, legal counsel, then explained the process. After the proposed PUD goes through Committee review and full Plan Commission review of the text of the Ordinance and conceptual plans, the Plan Commission will recommend approval or denial of the PUD Ordinance—that recommendation is forwarded to the City Council who makes the final decision. The City Council has 90 days to decide based on recommendations. The recommendation of the Plan Commission is not binding upon the Council, but it does have the effect of setting a default position. If the Council does nothing, the Plan Commission recommendation stands. Timing could possibly be 5 months for approval of the PUD. The PUD Ordinance will allow for what land uses are allowed and what the development standards are that apply to those land uses. Every building that comes through must come back through the Plan Commission and Committee for ADLS Review—after the PUD Ordinance is approved.

Leo Dierckman stated that at the next meeting, March 30th, the traffic topic will be revisited and what it will look like from Auman and 126th Street. Also, curb cuts onto Auman Drive will be discussed. Hopefully the other three quadrants can be looked at as well at this level of detail. The curb cuts onto Auman Drive will be discussed, maybe not the next meeting, but the one after.

Jim Shinaver wanted to be sure that the public understood the process and that public input would occur each time the developer comes back for Development Plan and ADLS review. Notice for those meetings would be published in the Indianapolis Star 25 days prior to the public hearing as well as certified mail to surrounding property owners two properties deep or 660 feet, whichever is less from the subject site that is at issue with the ADLS. The Rezone process is not the only process where public input occurs. If the PUD were approved, public notice would occur each time the petitioner returns to the Plan Commission for any section of DP/ADLS review and approval.

David Leazenby spoke about neighborhood meetings. There will be a meeting on March 27 with The Enclave neighborhood. March 1, 2006 a meeting was conducted at the Carmel Fire Station with The Enclave residents; March 2nd there was a meeting with the Cool Creek neighborhood at the Buckingham facility on the site; and Hunters Glen on February 6, 2006. There is a date pending for a meeting with the Eden Village neighborhood, and there have been numerous telephone conversations and emails. As far as communications with the current residents of Mohawk Apartments, we take that very seriously. Buckingham manages over 1400 units in Carmel and communication with the residents and area neighbors is extremely important.

David Leazenby agreed to meet with the Auman Addition residents prior to the next Committee meeting on March 30th.

Docket No. 05120025 Z, 126th & Keystone/Gramercy PUD was continued to the Special Studies Committee on March 30, 2006 at 6:00 PM in the Council Chambers, **subject to availability.**

2. Docket No. 05120018 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Professional Building (Pinnacle Pointe)

The applicant seeks to create a 2 story, 19,526 sq.ft. medical office building on 2.44 ac. The site is located at 12065 Old Meridian St. and is zoned B6 within the US 31 Overlay. Filed by Kevin Roberts of DeBoy Land Development for Allen Commercial Group.

Paul Reis, attorney with Bose, McKinney & Evans, 600 East 96th Street, Suite 500, Indianapolis 46240 appeared before the Committee representing the Allen Commercial. Also present: Bob Wildman and Kevin Roberts.

The biggest, outstanding issue was the landscape plan and a reduced version has been prepared. The petitioner met with Scott Brewer, Urban Forester last week and the landscape issues were discussed.

Some of the issues: 1) A drainage swale along Old Meridian Street that was in conflict with the landscaping—the swale has now been relocated so that there is no conflict. 2) An 8-inch water line and existing tree were at issue. The water line has been moved to preserve the tree. 3) There are four landscaping islands inside the parking area that will have trees within. Scott Brewer requested structural soils installed for the vitality of the trees and the petitioner has agreed to install the structural soils to allow for additional root growth. A detailed plan and specs for the structured soils will be sent to Scott Brewer so that he can approve of the plan. 4) The size of some of the trees was apparently too large at installation—the caliper of those trees has been reduced and they are now consistent with the Overlay Ordinance. Also, clarification has been given on the shrubs—the height and breadth is 24 inches and that revision has been made. Also on the plan is a highlight for the structured soils. The final item is a pedestrian connection to the pathway from the building and that has now been added.

All of the technical drainage issues are close to being resolved and Mike DeBoy from DeBoy Land Development services can answer any of those questions. It is hopeful that all of these issues will be worked out next week—if not before—with the Engineer's Department.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: The major issue was the landscaping plan; Scott Brewer has confirmed that what is now being proposed is what is required. Aside from the outstanding drainage concerns, the Department is recommending this item be forward to the full Commission with a positive recommendation, subject to drainage issues being resolved.

Note: The petitioner has not yet developed a signage plan; the petitioner will return at a future date for signage.

Madeleine Torres made formal motion to forward Document No. 05120018 DP/ADLS, Old Meridian Professional Building (Pinnacle Point) to the full Plan Commission with a positive

S:\PlanCommission\Minutes\Committees\SpecialStudies\2006\2006Mar16

recommendation for the meeting on March 21, 2006, seconded by Susan Westermeier, Approved 3-0.

Note: Items 3 and 4 were heard together.

3. Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Place

The applicant seeks to create 129 townhomes and a mix of office and retail uses on 25 acres.

The site is located at 12852 Old Meridian Street and is zoned OM/SFA.

Filed by Jon Isaacs for Centex Homes.

Jim Shinaver, attorney with Nelson & Frankenberger appeared before the Committee representing Centex Homes.

There are two aspects of this particular property located at the southwest corner of 136th Street and Old Meridian. Overall, the project consists of 25.46 acres. A substantial amount of the real estate is currently zoned Old Meridian/Single Family Attached and Old Meridian mixed use. A portion of the Old Meridian/Single Family Attached is now Old Meridian Mixed Use, as well as another section.

At the time a portion of the rezone was presented for the 4.2 acre parcel, Centex was undertaking efforts to acquire additional real estate and they were successful in getting it under contract. The rezone is tied to DP/ADLS approval. At the same time, the rationale for the rezone may actually exist independent of whether or not there is a specific site for the DP/ADLS. This particular layout, from a rezone perspective, allows the Old Meridian/Mixed Use corridor to reach farther up to the intersection and also transition between Old Meridian Special Use, Old Meridian Mixed Use, and Old Meridian Single Family Attached. These are two portions of the rezone being requested. The two parcels allow the petitioner to put together a unified project.

Jim Shinaver commented that the petitioner was hoping to discuss the rezone—not ADLS/DP—at the full Plan Commission meeting on March 21, 2006. If appropriate, ideally a recommendation would then be made by the Plan Commission to the City Council.

Leo Dierckman agreed that it made sense to combine these into one big parcel—the rezone and the DP/ADLS.

Matt Griffin responded that the Committee saw one rezone petition and on March 21st a new one will be introduced. The Commission must waive its Rules of Procedure in order to act on that item that evening.

Jim Shinaver reported that the rezone was noticed and the two waivers being requested at the 3-21 meeting would be the 60-day pre-filing requirement and the 25-day notice requirement under the Rules of Procedure—the 10-day State Statute requirement was met.

Mike Hollibaugh noted that to date, no members of the public have come forth to remonstrate; however, there was a person in the office today.

John Molitor felt that this is a very short period of time for neighbors to get organized to comment on a Rezone. The neighbors should have a full 25 days to get organized and decide if they want to remonstrate, or what course of action they want to take.

Mike Hollibaugh said there has been open communication on this item, not just with us but with the neighbors as well.

Jim Shinaver referred to the Plan Commission meeting on the 21st of February for the first small parcel—that meeting was properly noticed as far as 25 days in advance. The notice for the second parcel included the same list of owners. The feeling is that if there were a large group of people who were opposed to this rezone, we would have seen them on the 21st of February.

John Molitor commented that if the Staff recommends that the Commission should waive the Rules and the Commission is satisfied that no one is being disadvantaged, it would be OK.

Leo Dierckman said that if someone does speak up at the meeting, their issue might be with the ADLS and not the Rezone.

Sue Westermeier asked about a traffic analysis—Mike Hollibaugh responded that one was not required in this instance—the City did a traffic analysis as a part of the overall Meridian Plan. The City is improving Old Meridian, although that project is kind of stuck at the State level. Construction should begin late in the Spring and will probably be completed one year after. Old Meridian will be flowing boulevard with a roundabout at Main Street, an improved intersection at Carmel Drive, and a roundabout at Penn. There are no plans to widen Main Street (old State Road 234). The apartments will make improvements to their site and Corby Thompson will be making improvements—there will be some piece-meal improvements and if need be, the City will do the same. Old Meridian has been the back-bone for traffic. Now, too, the State has the funds for roadway improvements to US 31 and the City is still showing the interchange at 131st Street. If things go well, it will be year 2011 or potentially sooner for the improvements. As yet, there are no design decisions for US 31—the City is still plugging for its plan and the State is looking at it seriously.

Jon Isaacs, Centex Homes then re-introduced the DP/ADLS. The original site plan filed in December was minus the two additional properties now shown—the Zohar and Bosler. Two major concerns included the layout of the townhome line to the west of the main center road—we felt we were cutting the church off at the corner of Main and Old Meridian. The other concern is the existing approval of Corby Thompson's Townhome project that has set the stage for road infrastructure, not taking into account the Old Meridian Design Plan. One the Design Plan was obtained, it was apparent that the median did not align with the roadway into the project and this was a concern—having the roadway moved is a significant battle, or trying to come up with a way to bring the road south to align with the median that would not significantly hurt the plan. Mr. Bosler had some serious concerns about what would happen to his home when

S:\PlanCommission\Minutes\Committees\SpecialStudies\2006\2006Mar16

the property is rezoned and at the time, Centex did not pursue Mr. Bosler because we could never come to terms with his next-door neighbor. Purchasing the Bosler piece without the piece next door did not economically make sense and did nothing for the site plan. With the acquisition of the two parcels, the north end of the site could be reconfigured, move the road down, bring the Church property into a point where at least it fits. If we don't acquire the Church in the future, someone could acquire the Church in the future and make something happen OR the Church could expand in the future and offer shared parking.

The new site plan moves the road to the south and aligns with the median cut on Old Meridian. Centex is now able to get a better streetscape along Old Meridian. The design now brings the buildings close to the street to satisfy the retail market and also the Urban Design Initiative with parking to the rear. Parking is still behind the front building line of the buildings and the parking to the rear becomes significantly larger than previously planned with the ability to tie into something on the Church property in the future. The Church would really like to move or to build a new facility at this location—without knowing what the Church will do, there is nothing that Centex can pursue at the current time.

The new site plan added one additional condo building; the townhome units basically stayed the same design with the exception of an entry feature road that now is lined on both sides with the townhomes and is in line with the Old Meridian master plan that was done in 1999. At present, Centex is asking to change the Bosler parcel to mixed use. Ultimately the rezone would eliminate townhomes and include an additional product type that does not presently exist in the area and this is seen as a benefit.

Centex is looking for a partner that will develop the retail portion of the site. At this time, Centex anticipates a development plan approval for the entire property—road network, sewer, drainage, etc. From the architectural landscape requirements, Centex would like to solidify the townhomes across the front and at present, this is at a conceptual level. The drainage will be integral throughout the development—there will be underground detention under the greenspace and under the parking lot. There is another parking lot for underground detention if need be.

Jim Shinaver clarified that this project is not a PUD, and the petitioner will not be seeking any variances from the Old Meridian requirements.

Madeleine Torres commented that she would like different color facades, color schemes, roof lines, materials, etc. The townhomes are monotonous and Carmel is saturated with red brick.

Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS, Old Meridian Place was **continued** to the March 30, 2006 meeting for further review at 6:00 PM.

4. Docket No. 06010002 Z: Old Meridian Place Rezone

The applicant seeks to rezone 3.084 acres from Old Meridian Single Family Attached (OM/SFA) to Old Meridian Mixed Use (OM/MU) for the purpose of creating mixed use structures along Old Meridian Street. This project is in conjunction with the proposed Old Meridian Place development.

The site is located at 12852 Old Meridian Street and is oned OM/SFA.
Filed by Lawrence Kemper of Nelson and Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

See above comments.

Susan Westermeier made formal motion to forward **Docket No. 06010002 Z, Old Meridian Place Rezone to the full Plan Commission** with a positive recommendation, seconded by Madeleine Torres, approved 3-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Ramona Hancock, Secretary

Leo Dierckman, Chairperson